

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 3 remain in the application and stand rejected. Claims 4 – 15 are canceled herein without prejudice. Claims 1 and 2 are amended herein. New claims 16 – 30 are added herein. This Amendment is being filed with a request for a three (3) month extension of time and the appropriate fee. The Commissioner is hereby further authorized to charge any fees that may be required for this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

The amendment to claims 1 and 2 and new claims 16 – 30 are supported in the specification on page 3, line 20 – page 4, line 12, and Figures 1 and 2. No new matter is added. No reference of record shows matching data from “systems in an integrated services system, wherein each of said multiple systems has a unique identifier within said integrated services system” as recited in claim 1. Nor does any reference of record teach or suggest host systems, such as recited in claims 2, 16, 17, 24 and 25, matching/categorizing incident data as recited in claim 2; or, a warehousing system further categorizing data as recited in claims 18, 20 and 26 or generating reports as recited in claims 21 and 28 with real time information as recited in claims 22 and 29 or near real time information as recited in claims 23 and 30. Thus, the present invention provides preferred system users with timely reports that minimizes the number of times a support process is executed; and, minimizes the cost of executing a support process. Neither does any record of reference teach or suggest host systems relating data associated with a specific customer, as recited in claims 19 and 27; further minimizing support process execution frequency and cost. Independent consideration of claims 16 – 30 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 – 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over published U.S. Patent application number 2002/0123983 to Riley et al. in view of published U.S. Patent application number 2003/0088456 to Ernest et al. or further in view of U.S. Patent number 6370544 to Krebs et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office action asserts that the Riley et al. “Figure 2 elements 23,25,27,29, and others” are the recited “multiple systems” of claim 1.

However, Riley et al. provides that “FIG. 2 depicts an organization 20, such as an information technology organization, having a service desk capability 21 that supports **customers** in a variety of other **organizations**, including but not limited to, a sales **organization** 23, a human resources **organization** 25, a finance **organization** 27, e-commerce 29, as well as other **organizations**.” Paragraph 0033 (emphasis added). An organization within the meaning of the Riley et al. specification (i.e., of customers) is clearly not a “system” within the meaning of the present application. See M.P.E.P. §2111.

Moreover, claim 1 as amended recites “matching data elements from multiple systems in an integrated services system, wherein each of said multiple systems has a unique identifier within said integrated services system,” at lines 2 – 3. This is certainly neither shown nor suggested by Riley et al., Ernest et al. or any reference of record. Ernest et al., for example, teaches an IT management system wherein software agents monitor the technical condition of IT components and accumulate the number and type of business transactions each IT component handles. *See, e.g.*, paragraph 0008. As each IT component is utilized as part of a business transaction, the transaction type and discrete value are noted and the *raw data* is forwarded to a central collection location. *Id.* Therefore, Riley et al. in view of Ernest et al. fails to result in the present invention as recited in claim 1, as filed or as amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of claims 2 and 3, claim 2 is amended to recite the cooperation of systems in the integrated services system. This is neither shown nor suggested by Riley et al., Ernest et al., Krebs et al. or any reference of record. Krebs et al. shows “an enterprise management integration tool for providing a centralized repository for storage and processing of information related to the execution of the enterprise management functions.” Abstract, lines 1 – 4, and col. 1, lines 60 – 64. More specifically, Krebs et al. is a system and “method for integrating enterprise management applications **outside** of the management application” as recited in claims 1 and 2, lines 1 – 2 (emphasis added). Therefore, Riley et al. and Ernest et al. in further view of Krebs et al. fails to result in or suggest the present invention as recited in claim 2, as filed or as amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

The applicant has considered the other references cited, but not relied upon and find them to be no more relevant than the references upon which the rejection is based.

The applicants thank the Examiner for efforts, both past and present, in examining the application. Believing the application to be in condition for allowance, both for the amendment to the claims and for the reasons set forth above, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider new claims 16 – 30, reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1 – 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and allow the application to issue.

The applicants note that MPEP §706 “Rejection of Claims,” subsection III, “PATENTABLE SUBJECT MATTER DISCLOSED BUT NOT CLAIMED” provides in pertinent part that

If **the examiner** is satisfied after the search has been completed that patentable subject matter has been disclosed and the record indicates that the applicant intends to claim such subject matter, he or she **may note** in the Office action that **certain aspects or features** of the patentable invention have not been claimed and that if properly claimed such claims **may be given favorable consideration**.

(emphasis added.) The applicants believe that the matter presented in the written description of the present application is quite different than, and not suggested by, any reference of record. Accordingly, should the Examiner believe anything further may be required, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below for a telephonic or personal interview to discuss any other changes.

Respectfully submitted,

June 11, 2007
(Date)

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
(732) 321-3130

Francis G. Montgomery
Francis G. Montgomery
Reg. No. 41,202